REMARKS

The Examiner has required amendment of the application to recite the claim of priority. This application is the U.S. national phase of a PCT application, and a priority claim, from French Patent Application No. 02/16235, filed December 17, 2002, was made in the application papers, as shown on the official filing receipt. Therefore, Applicants believe that no petition is required. As suggested in the Official Action, Applicants attach an Application Data Sheet (ADS). Applicants submit that the priority claim has been properly made.

The Examiner has noted an error in the specification. Applicants note, however, that the passage cited by the Examiner (page 16, lines 23-25) is part of the original claims, which were cancelled by the Preliminary Amendment submitted with this application, and are therefore no longer part of the application. However, the same error occurs at pages 10-11 of the specification, and Applicants have amended the specification accordingly, to correct this typographical error.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 11, 12, and 14 under 35 USC 103, applying two different combinations of references. Both such combinations include the U.S. published patent application of Hegde (Publication No. 2004/0162558).

Applicants respectfully submit that Hegde is not prior art to the present application. The earliest priority date claimed by Hegde is February 18, 2003. The present application claims the priority of the French application mentioned above, which was filed on December 17, 2002.

To perfect further their priority claim, Applicants attach a certified English translation of the French application from which priority is claimed. The Examiner can verify that the disclosure of the French application is the same, in all material respects, as the present application. Therefore, Applicants submit that the present application can duly claim priority from December 17, 2002, and that Hegde should be removed as a reference.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that all of the pending claims are allowable over the known prior art.

Applicants therefore submit that the claims define a patentable invention. Applicants request reconsideration by the Examiner and early favorable action.